

## REMARKS

This amendment is an RCE in response to the final Office Action of August 10, 2007.

### I. Subject-matter of the invention

The present invention relates to methods (claims 1, 26, 34), computer readable media (claims 21, 30, 39) and devices (claims 17, 23, 40) for improved portrayal of navigation objects. At least two navigation objects are combined into one combined navigation object. The at least two navigation objects are graphical objects (e.g. image hyperlinks of an image map). The combining comprises merging the at least two navigation objects into a combined graphical navigation object (e.g. a scaled graphical representation of the image map). the combined navigation object is presented (e.g. in small scale). If the combined navigation object is selected, the at least two navigation objects are presented (e.g. in large scale).

### II. Prior art

U.S. 6,300,947 (*Kanevsky*)

*Kanevsky*, as newly introduced prior art, relates to a web page adaptation system and method that provide organization of viewing material associated with web sites for visual displays and windows on which these home pages are being viewed. A different viewing-access strategy is provided for such visual devices varying, for example, from standard PC monitors, laptop screens and palmtops to web phone and digital camera displays and from large windows to small windows. A new web site design incorporates features that permit automatic display of the content of home pages in the most friendly manner for a user viewing this content from a screen or window of a certain size. If a size of a screen or window does not allow display of all textual and icon information on a whole screen or window, the home page is mapped into hierarchically linked new smaller pages that fully fit the current display or window. The display strategy is provided by a web page adaptation scheme that is implemented on a web site server or is incorporated in a

web browser (e.g., as a java applet) or both. this adaptation strategy employs variables that provide size of screen and/or window information from which a call to a web site was initiated.

Inter alia, *Kanevsky* discloses that links L1, L2 and L3 related to a common topic can be represented by a link L123, and that links L1, L2 and L3 are displayed if link L123 is selected (col. 2, l. 20-40, the latter feature is at least implicitly disclosed with respect to the parallel description of the combining of icons). With reference to Fig. 14, *Kanevsky* discloses in col. 15, l. 38-61, that two icons are cut in half and combined into a single icon, wherein each half of the single icon can be selected by a user to activate the respective target associated with the icon. Therein, if several icons are related to the same topic, a new icon may be created for a given topic.

US 6,154,205 (*Carroll et al*)

*Carroll et al* relates to a television-based hyperlink content navigation system that includes a display device having a viewing area for displaying visual content such as an Internet Web document. Generally, the visual content has a content area that is larger than the viewing area, and includes a plurality of selectable objects such as hyperlinks and image maps. A user-manipulated operator such as a joystick allows navigation through the various hyperlinks and image maps, and also initiates scrolling of the visual content. Assuming that a focus is initially on a first one of the objects, moving the trackball tabs the focus to a nearby second object if the second object is within a predefined linear distance from the first object. If there is no second object within the predefined distance, moving the trackball causes the visual content to scroll at a speed that is proportional to the trackball speed. If a currently focused object is an image, such as an image map, that has a continuous two-dimensional range of selectable points, moving the trackball moves a pointer over the image in a continuous manner. Such a pointer is displayed only when the focus is on such a continuous image (see abstract).

### III. Summary of the Office Action

Furthermore, the Examiner is of the opinion that all claims – except claims 16, 20, 29, 33, 38 and 44, which are all related to image hyperlinks in an image map – are anticipated by *Kanevsky*, and that the aforementioned claims 16, 20, 29, 33, 38 and 44 are rendered obvious by a combination of *Kanevsky* and *Carroll*.

IV. Applicant's remarks

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's opinion that *Kanevsky* would disclose the subject-matter of the independent claims.

The Examiner asserts that *Kanevsky* would disclose that hyperlinks from a webpage would be combined into a composite icon, and that the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (see page 3, first paragraph of the Office Action).

It has however to be stressed that the claim wording requires “presenting said at least two navigation objects, if said combined navigation object is selected”, and not, as the Examiner cited, that “the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user” (emphasis supplied).

Thus even in case the Examiner should consider that, when displaying the combined navigation object, the at least two navigation objects merged into said combined navigation object would inherently be displayed, he neglects that the term “if” used in the claim language is always understood in a conditional sense, and not in a temporal sense. Thus when stating in the independent claims “presenting said at least two navigation objects, if said combined navigation object is selected”, it is clear from the meaning of “if,” in context, i.e., that the at least two navigation objects are presented only in case that the combined navigation object is selected (i.e. after its selection), and not inherently by displaying the combined navigation object. This is also readily clear from the description of the patent application, see for instance the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 and the second paragraph on page 19.

In the passage in col. 2, l. 20-45 as cited by the Examiner, it is only disclosed that multiple icons I1, I2 can be represented by a single icon I12, and that multiple links L1-L3 can be represented by a single link L123, and that icons I1 and I2 may be accessed via selection of icon I12.

The passage does however not disclose that the links would be graphical links, and that the links would be merged into a combined graphical link, since it is only disclosed that there is a link L123 representing links L1-L3.

Furthermore, the passage in col. 15, l. 35-61 cited by the Examiner describes with respect to fig. 14 that two icons are cut in half to form a single icon, wherein both halves of the single icon remain selectable to activate the application associated with the respective icon half. However, it is not disclosed in this passage that, upon selection of the single icon, the original icons would be displayed, since upon selection of a half of the single icon, directly an application (e.g. the “Internet Explorer”) is started.

*Kanevsky* does not disclose that the combined graphical navigation object is obtained from the at least two navigation objects by scaling, i.e., that the combined navigation object is a scaled representation of the at least two navigation objects. Scaling has the particular advantage that the combined navigation object still provides an impression of the at least two original navigation objects and thus does not alter the entire page design, in particular if the amount of scaling performed on the at least two navigation objects when generating the combined navigation objects is the same as the amount of scaling applied to the remainder of the page in which the at least two navigation objects are contained. Nevertheless, if the amount of scaling is substantial, the at least two navigation objects may no longer be properly recognizable, so that it is particularly advantageous that the combined navigation object can be selected to trigger displaying of the at least two navigation objects, e.g. in a larger form.

In this respect, the Examiner argued (with respect to dependent claim 24) that *Kanevsky* would also disclose the scaling operation. From the passages cited by the Examiner, applicant can however not deduce such disclosure. The Examiner first cites col. 2, l. 45-55. Therein, it is stated that content of web pages is “folded” or “expanded” depending on a size of a screen or window. This folding is explained in more detail in col. 9, l. 30-65, which is also cited by the Examiner. There it is stated that web pages are folded into several pages, objects stripped and links stripped and re-mapped if the user’s display size is smaller than the display size used for the web pages as defined by a web page designer (see col. 7, l. 57 to col. 8, l. 4).

The further passage cited by the Examiner in this respect, i.e., col. 8, l. 50-67, only discloses that the basic URL/CGI instructions may contain alternative URL/CGI instructions which indicate what type of display screen size is optimal for displaying the web page data.

However, a scaling operation, i.e., a change of size of at least two graphical navigation objects to obtain a combined graphical navigation object is not disclosed in these passages and also not in the entire disclosure of *Kanevsky*. *Kanevsky* deals with small screen displays by separating the web page into several sub-pages and by representing groups of icons or links by single icons or links.

Furthermore, applicant does not share the Examiner's opinion that the subject-matter of claim 10 (which depends on claim 5), i.e., that the combined navigation object is presented in a first display mode, which is a scaled format display mode, and that said at least two navigation objects are presented in a second display mode, which is an unscaled format display mode, would be disclosed by *Kanevsky*. From the four passages cited by the Examiner, only one passage seems to at least remotely address related subject-matter.

This passage in col. 11, l. 25-45 describes the embodiment of Fig. 12, where an original web page 1201 contains two icons "My Briefcase" and "Junk". It is stated that the icon "My briefcase" with higher priority is displayed on a reduced web page 1202, where for the second icon "Junk", only a link is provided, which points to the whole icon "junk" or another web page 1203. However, it is not disclosed here or rendered obvious that a combined navigation object, which is obtained by merging at least two navigation objects, is presented in a scaled format display mode, and that, upon selection of the combined navigation object, the at least two navigation objects would be presented in an unscaled format display mode. This is due to the fact that the "My Briefcase" icon in page 1202 is not scaled and does not form a combined navigation object with at least one other navigation object. It cannot be selected as a whole, and even when considering selection of the Junk link as a selection of a combined navigation object, not both icons, but only the Junk icon would be presented.

It is evident that this passage, and also the remainder of *Kanevsky*, does not disclose that a combined navigation object, which is obtained by merging at least

two navigation objects, is presented in a scaled format display mode, and that, upon its selection, the at least two navigation objects are presented in an unscaled format display mode. The feature reflects a particularly advantageous embodiment of the present invention, where navigation objects, which would be no longer recognizable when presented in scaled format display mode, can be inspected in unscaled format display mode by introducing the selectable combined navigation object.


With respect to the objections concerning the computer-readable media claims (claims 21, 22, 30 and 39), the original disclosure has been revised to provide explicit support for a computer-readable medium which was already there in substance.

Applicant has amended the independent claims by adding the feature of claim 24 (merging by scaling), and to buttress the above remarks showing the novelty and inventiveness of the present invention.

Withdrawal of the novelty and obviousness rejections is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of August 10, 2007, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1, 5-10 and 12-49 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Francis J. Maguire". The signature is stylized with a large, circular loop at the end.

Francis J. Maguire

Attorney for the Applicant

Registration No. 31,391

FJM/lk  
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
(203) 261-1234